DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 144 543 95 IR 005 001

TITLE NORWELD. Third Annual Report. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Northwest Library District, Bowling Green, Ohio.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 38p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Annual Reports; Interlibrary Loans; Library Administration; Library Cooperation; *Library Networks; Library Reference Services; *Public Libraries; Public Relations; Questionnaires
IDENTIFIERS Northwest Library District

ABSTRACT

This report covers the period from January 1 to December 31, 1976, which was the third year of operation for NORWELD. Thirty-five public libraries and one state library agency from 12 northwestern Ohio counties participated in various degrees in the activities of this multicounty library cooperative formed in 1974. NORWELD's objectives and activities are reviewed in the following areas: (1) reference and interlibrary loan; (2) staff development; (3) public relations; and (4) administration. Patron and evaluation questionnaires are appended. (Author/AP)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED144543

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NORWELD
Northwest Library District
Third Annual Report
January 1 - December 31, 1976
(with an extension through January 31, 1977)

(L.S.C.A. Project # I-16-F-76)
(FINAL REPORT)

Submitted by
Richard C. Pritsky
NORWELD Director
May 31, 1977

NORWELD
Northwest Library District
P. O. Box 828
Bowling Green, Ohio 43402

I R000701

CONTENTS

Coverage and Distribution 3

Introduction 4

Reference and Interlibrary Loan 5

Media 7

Staff Development 9

Public Relations 10

Administration 11

APPENDICES:

I - Patron Questionnaire 14

II - Member Library Questionnaire 20

IIIa - Interlibrary Loans 32

IIIb - Reference Requests 33

IIIc - Core Reference Statistics 34

IVa - Super-8 Circulation 35

IVb - Media Grants 36

COVERAGE AND DISTRIBUTION

This report covers the NORWELD project year beginning January 1, 1976, and ending December 31, 1976, with a one month extension granted through January 31, 1977. It provides an overview of NORWELD activities supported by L.S.C.A. funds granted through project # I-16-F-76.

* * *

160 copies of this report have been reproduced for distribution to the directors and board presidents of all member libraries, to all NORWELD committee members, to the State Library of Ohio and its appropriate personnel, to key persons at the NORWELD resource library, to potential member libraries, to other Ohio multicounty library cooperatives, to NORWELD office files, and to other interested parties while the supply lasts.

* * *

This publication was supported by Federal Library Services and Construction Act Title I funds, granted by the State Library of Ohio.

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

INTRODUCTION

1976 was the third year of NORWELD, a multicounty library cooperative formed in 1974 out of the merger of two earlier cooperatives, WELD and NW5. Thirty-five public libraries and one state library agency from the twelve Northwestern Ohio counties of Defiance, Erie, Fulton, Hancock, Henry, Huron, Lucas, Ottawa, Paulding, Sandusky, Seneca, and Wood participated in various degrees in the 1976 activities of NORWELD.

The programs are described according to and within the context of the Application for L.S.C.A. I Special Project Grant which was approved by the NORWELD Governing Council on October 15, 1975, and by the State Library of Ohio through the granting of funds to Project # I-16-F-76 as approved by the State Library Board on December 3, 1975. The activities in 1976 have been measured against the stated objectives in the application and also against the programs of 1974 and 1975 as described in previous annual reports.

For additional, substantiating evaluations and for indications of NORWELD's impact on member libraries and patrons, consult Appendices I and II of this report.

REFERENCE AND INTERLIBRARY LOAN

Objectives:

1) To provide in-depth reference service by telephone and mail.
   a. To handle 3400 questions, providing bibliographic information when necessary.
   b. To provide 2,000 photocopies of materials when expedient.
2) To handle 11,000 interlibrary loans of general reading matter on all levels and of specialized audio recordings, excluding current materials in popular demand.
3) To provide each participating library with a grant of $75 to purchase bibliographic tool needed to expedite interlibrary loan requests.

As compared with the increase in reference and interlibrary loan network usage of 1975 over 1974, this year proved to be one of leveling off, in contrast to the numerical estimates put forth by the project objectives. The curtailment of service hours begun during the second quarter at Toledo-Lucas County Public Library, NORWELD's resource library, was a probable factor, as was the introduction at the same time of written Procedures and Guidelines for using the network. Supporting this view is the fact that during the first quarter of 1976 both loans (2,701) and reference questions (847) maintained the originally projected rate of use; a dramatice drop occurred in both rates (1,939 and 463) in the second quarter and continued through the remainder of 1976. (See Appendices IIIa and IIIb for complete quarterly figures.)

The realization that continued dramatic growth in network use was not necessarily a desireable objective came at a NORWELD Ombudsman Committee meeting in early January, 1976. Work then began on written rules for using the network in a more orderly fashion. The Committee met again in February to further refine the written document, which was then sent out to the NORWELD membership for comment and criticism. A membership meeting held May 7 at the resource library provided another opportunity to discuss the revised draft of the rules. Forty-four librarians from twenty-four libraries attended this meeting. The NORWELD Advisory Committee adopted the final version of the Procedures and Guidelines at its meeting of May 12, 1976, at which point the document became effective.

As in previous years, Nancy Swegan of Toledo-Lucas County Public Library supervised the working of the NORWELD reference and interlibrary loan network at the resource library. A direct telephone line to the network office in Toledo was maintained again through 1976, with member libraries being reimbursed for all calls to that number. As noted in Objective (2) above, recorded discs were added to the list of materials available for loan to NORWELD libraries.

1) The NORWELD network handled 2,363 reference questions in 1976, off the objective by 31% and down from 1975 by 14%. A comparison with previous years is offered in the following table:

	1974	1975	1976
# members	29	34	34
# Asked	2226	2747	2360
# Handled[a]	1797	2723	2363
# Answered[b]	1639	2574	2249
% Answered[c]	91.2%	94.5%	95.2%
# Asked per member	77	81	69

[a]not answered + referred + partially answered + answered on "Core Reference Statistics", Appendix IIIc.

[b]includes total and partial answers.

[c]# answered ÷ # handled.

Additional information on 1976 reference and photocopy use will be found in Appendices IIIb and IIIc.

2) The network handled 9,159 interlibrary loan requests in 1976, down from the objective by 17%. Member libraries received 8,356 loans, off the 1975 figure by 9%. Comparable 1974 and 1975 figures for loans handled and requested are not available.

	1974	1975	1976
# members	29	34	34
cited requests received	--	--	8009
cited requests handled[a]	--	--	9159
cited requests answered	--	--	6466
all loans made	6607	9181	8356
% answered[b]	--	--	70.6%
loans per library	228	270	246

[a]not answered + referred + answered on "Core Reference Statistics", Appendix IIIc.

[b]answered ÷ handled.

3) Each full member library received a grant of $75 to purchase books which would help expedite network loan requests by providing each member with a new or additional source of author, title, and publisher verification. Purchases were made according to the following priority list:

Priority 1 - Books in Print
Priority 2 - Forthcoming Books
Priority 3 - Public Library Catalog, Fiction Catalog, Book Publishing Record, Magazines for Libraries (Katz), Schwann Catalog (recordings), or any other bona-fide bibliographic tool.

From the 34 grants distributed, 50 books were purchased: Books in Print - 12; Forthcoming Books - 6; Public Library Catalog - 5; Book Publishing Record - 3; Magazines for Libraries - 1; Schwann Catalog - 2; and other titles - 21. The grant assured that every member had at least BIP and FB available to verify requests, which also contributed to leveling off the number of requests--previously unverified--sent to the resource library.

The following persons were members of the 1976 NORWELD Ombudsman Committee:

Sally Burmeister, Oak Harbor P.L.
Michael French, Rossford P.L.
Roberta Vermaaten, Wood County P.L.
Sharon Winkle, Sandusky L. Assoc.

Patron and library evaluations of the NORWELD reference and interlibrary loan network were very positive. See the appropriate sections in the evaluation questionnaires included as Appendices I and II of this report.

MEDIA

Objectives:

1) To maintain the Super-8mm film circuits by the purchase of 200 new films to replace those damaged and to add new members to the circuit.
2) To improve library media services with a $1300 grant for each library to purchase the hardware or software most needed by the community.

1) A massive cleaning, inspection, and repair of the nearly 1,100 super-8mm films in the circuit prior to 1976 was undertaken during the first part of the year and was completed by the end of June. As of July 1, 42 libraries and branches had joined the circuit, an increase of 17% over 1975. More than 200 new films were purchased before July to make up the additional collections of 30 films needed. The 1976 circulation of 11,220 is an increase of 16% over the previous year.

	1974[a]	1975	1976
# NORWELD libraries	29	34	34
# circuit libraries[b]	22	30	29
# circuit branches	0	6	13
# films	300	1080	1320
# film groups	22	36	44[c]
# films per group	14	30	30

	1974	1975	1976
circulation	2908	9633	11220
circ./film	9.7	8.9	8.5
circ./film/month	1.6	.7	.7
circ./library	132.2	267.6	267.1
circ./library/month	22.0	22.3	22.3

[a]all statistics are for 6 months only, since the circuit did not start until July 1, 1974.

[b]as of July of each year

[c]two extra groups formed to come to NORWELD office monthly for cleaning and inspection.

Fifty-one libraries and branches were eligible to participate in the 1976 circuit; 82% took advantage of the opportunity. As can be seen in the above table, while total circulation and participating libraries and branches has increased, usage per film and per library per month seems to have stabilized. Film usage by library and quarter is presented in Appendix IVa of this report.

The following persons were members of the Super-8 Subcommittee which monitered the circuit:

Evelyn Basil, North Baltimore P.L.
Wilson Couch, Milan-Berlin Twp. P.L.
Donald Fought, Ida Rupp P.L., Port Clinton
Miriam Rader, McComb P.L.

The subcommittee met two times during the course of the year.

Patron and librarian responses to the circuit are summarized in the appropriate sections of Appendices I and II.

2) 1976 was the second year in which a media grant was offered to member libraries. The $1300 per library was used to strengthen the budding media capabilities stimulated by the 1975 grant. The funds were used for both hardware and software and allowed libraries to purchase A/V storage equipment and other types of hardware which brought the advantages of modern technology to the library. More than 1500 records, 400 cassette and 8-track tapes, 200 filmstrips, and a number of 16mm/8mm/filmstrip/slide projecters, screens, microfilm readers and printers, and the like augmented the resources and services available at NORWELD member libraries. A detailed breakdown of purchases made is included as Appendix IVb of this report.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Objective:

1) To provide at least 30 librarians with information on the possibilities of outreach and services to the handicapped.
2) To acquaint at least 30 children's librarians with the use of puppets in library services to children.
3) To assist at least 25 library administrators in mastering the complexities of setting library policies.
4) To provide the opportunity for 35 librarians and trustees to meet at two book discussion meetings, one in the spring and one in the fall.

A total of 217 librarians, trustees, and staff members attended the 4 workshop sessions and 2 book discussion meetings held as part of the 1976 NORWELD program.

1) Thirty-one persons from 25 libraries attended the Outreach Workshops held October 7 at Huron P.L. and October 13 at Delta P.L. Eunice Lovejoy, State Library Consultant, reviewed service developments in both morning sessions, and the afternoons were devoted to panels of librarians and other experts.

2) Forty-one children's librarians from 23 libraries and branches attended the Puppetry Workshop at Rossford Public Library which was run by A. Michael Deller from the Bloomfield Township Public Library in Michigan. The session was held April 9, 1976.

3) Forty-three persons, including 19 trustees, from 18 libraries attended the Workshop on Personnel Policies held in the late afternoon and evening of April 7, 1977, at Way Public Library, Perrysburg. This workshop was postponed because of scheduling problems in late 1976 and was rescheduled for January 27, 1977 but again postponed because of a snow storm. The workshop was a buffet dinner meeting, which allowed the excellent turnout of trustees. The program featured Donald Burrier (Personnel Officer, Toledo-Lucas Co. P.L.), Judith Coleman (Bellevue P.L.), Kevin Flaherty (State Library), Dorothy Strouse (Director Emeritus, Lucas Co. P.L.), and Sharon Winkle (Library Association of Sandusky) in a panel discussion before dinner; after dinner, Don Burrier spoke on additional policy considerations.

4) The Spring Book Discussion Meeting was held April 9, 1976, at Rossford Public Library and was organized by Michael French (Rossford) and John Storck (North Baltimore). Forty-two persons from 18 libraries reviewed their favorite "How-to" books and heard Alice Naylor (U. of Toledo) and Jane Roberts (B.G.S.U.) present "New Problematic and Controversial Books for Children and Adolescents".

Donald Fought (Port Clinton) and Sharon Winkle (Sandusky) organized the Fall Book Discussion Meeting. Fifty persons from 20 libraries attended the meeting at Ida Rupp P.L., Port Clinton, on November 5. Four stimulating local authors--Dwight Boyer, R.J. Dodge, Joel Rudinger, and Pat Leimbach--spoke out on libraries, read poetry, and recalled local history and anecdotes of Northwestern Ohio.

The following librarians were members of the Workshops Committee:

Grace Luebke (Harris-Elmore P.L.)
William Paplinski (Willard M.L.)
Gretchen Pritsky (Rossford P.L.)
G.W. Stanbery (Findlay-Hancock Co. P.L.)
Imogene Walter (Swanton P.L.)

The committee met twice during the course of the year.

Commentary on the workshops can be found in the appropriate section of Appendix II, the library questionnaire summary.

PUBLIC RELATIONS

Objectives:

1) To continue to assist at least 10 libraries in developing a polished media demonstration that would remain with each library to be used to publicize and promote the library to its community.
2) To provide attractive and informative general public relations materials for the NORWELD public libraries.
3) To promote cooperation among member libraries by increasing awareness of the special collections and services existing in each NORWELD library.

1) Interested libraries had approximately 1,000 slide pictures taken and developed by the NORWELD office for use in library displays and programs.

2) An area artist, Edward Rihacek, agreed to be NORWELD's consultant to produce attractive P.R. materials. 10,000 bookmarks and 150 posters were produced to draw attention to NORWELD's reference and interlibrary loan services. (A marked increase in patron awareness of network services was recorded by the patron questionnaire, and could be attributed to these attractive materials. See Appendix I, section I.A3.) In addition, 10,000 bookmarks and 100 posters describing the Super-8mm film circuit were distributed. Mr. Rihacek designed a special logo for the Super-8mm films, based on the regular NORWELD logo.

3) Six issues of a NORWELDer newsletter were published and distributed to 125 member library directors, committee members, board presidents, and other interested parties, thus keeping them aware of current area library news and events.

The second edition of the NORWELD Directory of Member Libraries was published in 1976, with 150 copies being printed. The Directory included, among other things, an opportunity for members to describe special collections and services at their libraries; 27 of 34 main libraries took advantage of this opportunity.

The Public Relations Subcommittee met three times during the year. The following persons were members:

Richard Gooch (Birchard P.L., Fremont)
Mary Morrison (Findlay-Hancock Co. P.L.)
Eleanor Richards (Genoa Branch, Harris-Elmore P.L.)
Carol Scherer (Delta P.L.)
Betty Thompson (North Baltimore P.L.)

Comments on the public relations program by member library directors will be found in the appropriate section of Appendix II.

ADMINISTRATION

Objective:

To maintain for the project director and office staff an operational base from which to serve the needs of the project and coordinate other NORWELD cooperative opportunities which may arise during the course of 1976.

In 1976, the NORWELD office was again located at the Wood County District Public Library, 251 North Main, Bowling Green, 43402. Richard Pritsky was project director throughout 1976. Bonnie Ross was office secretary through June 22, 1976, after which the position was assumed by Debra Ann Finney.

Members of the 1976 NORWELD Advisory Committee were

Librarians:

Wilson Couch, Vice-chairman (Milan)
Donald Fought (Port Clinton)
Michael French (Rossford)
Phyllis Gallo (Perrysburg)
Betty Jo Gioffre (Huron)
Richard Gooch (Fremont)
William Paplinski (Willard)
Marian Parker (Bowling Green)
John Storck, Chairman (North Baltimore)
Sharon Winkle (Sandusky)

Trustees:

Barbara Carpenter (Norwalk)
Rose Curtis (Perrysburg)
Mary Ewing (McComb)
John Huston (Bellevue)
Ellen Lehman (Huron)
G.E. Mallott (Defiance)
Nancy McClimans (Vermilion)
Glenna Myers (Oak Harbor)
John Myles (Liberty Center)
Margaret Porter (Metamora)

The Advisory Committee met six times in 1976 at regularly scheduled meetings to oversee the on-going concerns of the project. The Governing Council, composed of one librarian and trustee from each full member library, met in January with 15 librarians and trustees from 12 libraries and in July with 35 from 21 libraries in attendance. NORWELD's system of committees involved 38 persons from 26 libraries in the operations of the project.

A Goals and Directions Committee was established in 1976 with the following members:

Ardath Danford (Toledo)
Michael French (Rossford)
Phyllis Gallo (Perrysburg)
Raymond Gallo (Bookmobile Center)
Marian Parker (Bowling Green)
G.W. Stanbery (Findlay)
Imogene Walter (Swanton)
Cynthia Zuvers (Archbold)

The committee met three times during the year and drafted a preliminary set of objectives for NORWELD as set forth below:

The Goal of NORWELD: To provide quality library service to the people of Northwestern Ohio through inter-library cooperation.

The 5-Year (1977-1981) Objectives of NORWELD

I. NORWELD shall develop an information and resource programs by means of

   A. Stronger print collections for members
   B. In-service training
   C. Back-up reference network providing

      1. Answers to questions
      2. Photocopies
      3. Interlibrary loans

II. NORWELD shall develop a non-print media/A-V service program by means of

   A. A 16mm film library
   B. A lease program of 16mm films for in-house activities
   C. Continuing the Super-8 circuit, and planning for increasing sophistication of 8mm technology
   D. Stronger media collections for member libraries
   E. Developing staff capabilities in this area

III. NORWELD shall develop a research & development capability in order to provide:

A. Effective delivery systems
B. For the collection and analysis of statistics
C. Effective communication systems
D. A basis from which to direct NORWELD's future

During 1976, the project director attended more than 50 meetings and visited--both formally and informally--29 member libraries and 11 branches. In addition to responsibilities with respect to the present project, the director was involved with a separate 16mm film project, a book loan project between NORWELD and the Regional Bookmobile Center, and research into various other service and program options for NORWELD Members.

Full Membership in NORWELD remained at 34 in 1976, but two additional libraries joined in March: Toledo-Lucas County Public Library became a contributing member and the State Regional Bookmobile Center at Napoleon an associate member.

APPENDIX I

1976 NORWELD Patron Questionnaires

RETURNS

920 forms were distributed to the 34 full member libraries and their 16 branches. 335 forms were returned from 22 libraries and 5 branches. Patron return rate was thus 36%, down 9 points from the 1975 rate of 45%. Library and branch returns, however, were 54%, up 1 point from the 1975 rate of 53%. Thus the average number of forms returned per library returning forms was down to 12, as compared with 16 in 1975. The following list identifies those libraries that returned patron forms, followed by the number returned.

Archbold, McLaughlin M.L. - 11
Bellevue P.L. - 20
Castalia B., Sandusky L. Assoc. - 8
Clyde P.L. - 12
Defiance P.L. - 20
Delta P.L. - 20
Deshler, Patrick Henry S.D.P.L. - 12
Fayette, Normal M.L. - 5
Genoa B., Harris-Elmore P.L. - 10
Hamler B., Patrick Henry S.D.P.L. - 9
Hicksville, Johnson M.L. of Defiance - 8
Huron P.L. - 20
Liberty Center P.L. - 7
McComb P.L. - 6
Metamora P.L. - 10
Milan-Berlin Twp. P.L. - 9
North Baltimore P.L. - 3
Norwalk P.L. - 12
Oak Harbor P.L. - 19
Perrysburg, Way P.L. - 19
Rossford P.L. - 18
Sandusky L. Assoc. - 20
Stony Ridge B., Pemberville - 13
Swanton P.L. - 11
Tiffin-Seneca P.L. - 21
Wauseon P.L. - 6
Wayne P.L. - 6

RESPONSES

In general, this questionnaire was more successful than that of 1975 in eliciting usable responses to the questions posed: more multiple choices were provided for each question, thus making it easier for the patron to respond and for the tabulators to group similar answers; and a greater effort was made to eliminate words and phrases which assumed a knowledge of library services, procedures, and jargon not normally found amongst the general public. (Note: the numbering pattern used below follows that used on the questionnaire.)

I. Interlibrary Loan and Reference Network:

A1. 48% or 161 of the responding patrons had used the NORWELD network to borrow materials from other libraries in 1976. Since those who were not sure were asked to answer "NO", this figure could well have been even higher.

A2. 158 responses were made to this question by those who answered "YES" in A1. 148 or 94% said they received the materials promptly and got what they needed. Only one felt the materials arrived too late to be useful, while nine made various other responses, which were generally favorable or neutral. There are no 1975 figures with which to compare these very favorable results.

A3. 176 responese were made here by the 174 patrons who answer "NO" in A1. 39 (22%) felt that they would have used the service, had they known it existed. In 1975, 93 out of 198 responses (47%) to a similar

question indicated that patrons did not know the service existed. Assuming these figures are comparable, we can make a case that member libraries have increased the patron population's awareness of this NORWELD service, since non-awareness percentages have fallen in one year by 25 points or 53%.

B1. 327 of 335 forms contained answers to this question. 83 (25%) indicated they had used the NORWELD network to have a question answered.
B2. 93% of the 83 responses to this question indicated that the answers to questions came promptly (66%) and were exactly what was needed (27%). There are no 1975 figures with which to compare these responses.
B3. 234 responses were received from the 244 who answered "NO" to B1. 51 (22%) said they would have used the service had they known it existed. Interestingly, this percentage is the same as that recorded in response to a similar question in A3., thus allowing for similar conclusions to be drawn with regard to patron awareness.

C. 133 patrons answered these questions--the rest left this space blank, probably because no multiple answer choices were provided. Of the answers given, 94% were positive with regard to the worthiness of the network.

Comparison of the answers given in A1 and B1 yields the following interesting figures: 19% (65) of the responding patrons used both the interlibrary loan and reference aspects of the network; 29% (96) used the I.L.L. but not the reference (or did not answer B1); 5% (18) used the reference but not the interlibrary loan; and 47% (156) used neither. Lumping together those patrons who used at least one aspect of the network at least once during the year (179) yields a user group comprising 53% of the responding patrons. This percentage is a 6.1 point (13%) increase in user group size over the 46.9% found in 1975. This figure tends to support the drop by 53% from 1975 to 1976 in patrons not aware of the NORWELD Reference and Interlibrary Loan Network. These results would thus seem to indicate that 1) local libraries did more in 1976 to inform their patrons of NORWELD's service, and 2) the NORWELD bookmarks and posters displayed in local libraries succeeded in their objective to increase user awareness: people are not using NORWELD because they had no need, rather than because they did not know it existed.

II. Super-8mm Film Circuit:
325 responses were received in this section out of the 335 forms returned. 53 (16.3%) had borrowed at least one film during the course of 1976; this percentage is an insignificant increase of .9 over the 15.4% of 1975, indicating a fairly stable clientele for this service.

A. Six questions were asked in this section of those who answered "YES" above. There were 55 "YES" responses to questions one and two, which taken together indicate that 78% of the super-8 film usage in the home, supporting the contention that this service satisfies the individual patron's needs more than those of community groups. (Our recently completed 16mm film project--# I-16-B-75--found 87% of these films being checked out for showings outside of the home.)

Questions 3 and 4 asked about the source of equipment. 42% of the borrowers owned their own projector. Of the remaining patrons, 69% borrowed a projector from their library. NORWELD libraries are providing a needed service by making projectors as well as films available to patrons: 40% of the patrons using films might not have had the opportunity if equipment had not also been available at the library.

Question 5 found 89% of the patrons of the opinion that films were in fair to excellent condition when they received them. For question 6, all 49 responding persons felt the service was a worthwhile one to provide.

B. Question 1 of this section asked the 272 persons who had not used Super-8 films to tell us why not. 9% (21) said they were interested but did not know of the service. This non-awareness percentage compares favorably with the 22% of the interlibrary loan and reference network--films are much more visible than a "network". However, even more than last year, 23% wanted to borrow films but had no projector on which to show them. This result indicates either that libraries using super-8 films should have projectors available for loan, or that the availability of equipment should be better publicized, if a projector is already owned.

Question 2 of this section asked for an evaluation of this service by those patrons who do not use it. 97% of the responses were favorable to the service.

III. General Patron Information

The typical person answering the questions on this form was a 30 to 45 year old woman who comes to the library about once per week.

A. 66% of the responding patrons were female.

B. 9.2% were under eighteen; 21.3% between 18 and 29, 32.9% between 30 and 45; 22.3% between 46 and 59; and 14.3% 60 years of age and older. 30.5% were under 30 years old; 55.2% were over 30 but under 60; and 36.6% were over 45 years old.

C. 37% of the responding patrons visited the library about once per week; 57% came <u>at least</u> once per week; and 88% came <u>at least</u> twice per month, indicating--as expected--that these forms were mainly completed by strong users and probably strong supporters of the library.

IV. Final Comments

Some 60 persons made general comments in this space which was provided to them. Most of the comments were very favorable. Many were directed to the local library and its services, not to NORWELD. A number simply said such things as "Keep up the good work", "very worthwhile", or "please continue it". Some of the more individual comments were:

"I do not know why more people don't take advantage of all the library has to offer."

"I'm very pleased with the book I got from this system and appreciate being able to draw on a larger selection."

"Service has been quick, efficient, and I have appreciated obtaining books that this library does not have in stock. Many thanks."

"I'm very glad I can have this type of service so easily and cheaply. Thank you."

"You are doing a wonderful service to the community."

"My librarian procured a book for me which I was seeking. I was pleasantly surprised at this extra service."

"Excellent service for small libraries."

"Please do not discontinue or even reduce the service."

"Over all, I think NORWELD is a real help and convenience for people needing information."

"There are times I have needed things in addition to what we have here and I enjoy knowing they can be obtained for me."

"NORWELD adds to the fine service our library offers for self-improvement and enjoyment."

"Continue the service!!!"

NORWELD
Northwest Library District
c/o Wood County District Public Library
P. O. Box 828
Bowling Green, Ohio 43402
(419) 353-5721

PATRON

QUESTIONNAIRE

1976

TOTALS
Sent out 920
Returned 335

Dear Library Patron:

Your public library is an active member of NORWELD, a cooperative project serving libraries in 12 counties of Northwestern Ohio, and supported by local and federal funds. To learn how successful we have been in meeting some of your library needs, please answer the following questions and return this form to the librarian. Many thanks for your help!

I. Through our Interlibrary Loan and Reference Network, your library can borrow books, records, and copies of magazine articles for you from other libraries. If you have a question, the network can find the information your library might need to provide you with a complete answer.

A1. In 1976, did you use our network to borrow anything from other libraries? (If you are not sure, please answer NO) 161 YES/ 174 NO

A2. If you answered YES, please check the phrase which describes the service you received:

148 materials received promptly, and were what I needed.
0 materials were not what I had requested.
1 materials arrived too late to be useful.
9 OTHER (please explain) _____

A3. If you answered NO, please check the phrase which best describes your reasons:

39 would have used the service, but did not know it existed.
118 knew of the service, but did not need it in 1976.
19 OTHER (please explain) _____

B1. In 1976, did you use our network to have a question answered? (If you are uncertai please answer NO) 83 YES/ 244 NO

B2. If you answered YES, please check the two phrases which best describe the answer you received:

55 answer came promptly.
0 answer came too late to be useful.
22 answer was exactly what I needed.
4 answer was only partially what I needed.
1 answer was not what I needed.
1 OTHER (please explain) _____

(Please answer the additional questions that appear on the other side of this paper.)

B3. If you answered NO to question B1, please check the phrase which best describes your reasons:

51 would have used the service, but did not know it existed.
161 knew of the service, but did not need it in 1976.
22 OTHER (please explain) _____

C. Do you have any other comments or suggestions for improving the Interlibrary Loan and Reference Network? Is this network a worthwhile service for libraries to provide?

positive comments - 125
negative comments - 8

II. Every month, libraries that have joined the NORWELD Super-8 Circuit receive 30 different 8mm home movies to loan to patrons. During 1976, did you borrow any of these films from your library? 53 YES/ 272 NO

A. If you answered YES:
1. Did you borrow them for home use? 43 YES/ 6 NO
2. Did you borrow them to show somewhere else? 12 YES/ 36 NO
3. Do you own your own 8mm movie projector? 19 YES/ 26 NO
4. If you answered "no", from what source did you borrow a projector?
library-18 neighbor/friend/relative-4 school/church-4
5. Please comment on the condition of the films you borrowed:
fair/good/excellent-39 poor-5
6. Do you feel this service is a worthwhile one?
yes-49 no-0

B. If you did not borrow any films:
1. Please check the phrase which best describes your reasons:
4 My library is not a member of the 8mm film circuit.
21 Would have borrowed, but did not know the films were available.
132 Knew the films were available, but did not want to borrow them.
55 Knew the films were available, wanted to borrow them, but did not have a projector on which to show them.
28 OTHER (please explain) _____

2. Do you feel it is worthwhile for your library to offer this kind of film service?
yes-254
no- 9

III. General Patron information:
A. Sex: 216 female/ 109 male
B. Age: 30 under 18/ 70 18-29/ 108 30-45/ 73 46-59/ 47 60 and up
C. On the average, how often do you visit your library? see below

IV. The space below is for any final comments, criticisms, or recommendations you wish to make with regard to NORWELD:

III C. almost every day-15
2 or more times per week-40
weekly-100
every 2-3 weeks-47
2-3 times per month-36
monthly-24
every 2-3 months-8
2 times per year-1
frequently/often-3
occasionally-6
rarely/seldom-4

MANY THANKS FOR YOUR HELP. WE WISH YOU AN ENJOYABLE HOLIDAY SEASON!

APPENDIX II

1976 NORWELD EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRES For Member Libraries

RETURNS

Questionnaires were sent on November 22, 1976 to the directors of the 34 full member libraries and their 16 branches. 26 libraries and 3 branches returned forms for a return rate of 58% of all questionnaires distributed and 76.5% for main libraries. Forms were received from

Archbold, McLaughlin M.L.
Bellevue P.L.
Castalia B., Sandusky L Assoc.
Clyde P.L.
Defiance P.L.
Delta P.L.
Deshler, Patrick Henry C D.P.L.
Fayette, Normal M.L.
Findlay-Hancock Co. P.L.
Genoa B., Harris-Elmore P.L.
Hicksville, Johnson M.B., Defiance
Huron P.L.
Liberty Center P.L.
McComb P.L.
Metamora P.L.
Milan-Berlin Twp. P.L.
North Baltimore P.L.
Norwalk P.L.
Oak Harbor P.L.
Perrysburg, Way P.L.
Port Clinton, Ida Rupp P.L.
Rossford P.L.
Sandusky L. Assoc.
Swanton P.L.
Vermilion P.L.
Wauseon P.L.
Wayne P.L.
Weston P.L.
Willard M.L.

Twenty-four of these libraries and branches, or 83%, also returned patron questionnaires.

RESPONSES

The questionnaire was divided into seven parts, covering specific NORWELD programs and some general questions. A summary and tabulation of usable answers received for each part is included on the accompanying sample questionnaire form. No responses are recorded for part VI "Administration", since they were scattered, not relevant or generally unusable for this report. The summary of responses to part VII.A. would not fit in the space provided on the questionnaire, and is thus included elsewhere in two tables. (note: the numbering pattern used below follows that used on the questionnaire.)

I. REFERENCE AND INTERLIBRARY LOAN NETWORK:

A. All 19 impressions received of the 1976 network were positive. Of the 23 comments received concerning service, 9% felt the service had diminished. Five responses, however, did indicate problems with the delivery of materials via the U.S. Postal Service.

B. 73% answered yes to a question of whether or not their use of the network changed in 1976. It is interesting to note by means of this section the discrepancy between the perceptions of use recorded by this questionnaire versus the actual use made of the network in 1976 as compared with 1975: it seems unlikely

that use of interlibrary loan could increase in 15 (68%) of the responding libraries while total figures show an actual decrease in loans from 1975 to 1976. It turns out that while 15 felt use increased, 3 that it decreased, and 4 that it stayed the same; in fact--of responding main libraries--only 8 showed an actual increase, 18 a decrease, and none stayed the same. In a similar manner, reference use--perceived on the questionnaires as 14 increase, 3 decrease, and 4 the same--actually turns out to be 8 increase, 17 decrease, and one the same. Indeed, for all 34 full member libraries, only 11 showed an increase in reference and/or interlibrary loan use.

C. Written procedures and guidelines for using the network were implemented in May, 1976, at which time significant changes in use by libraries began to occur. Of 17 responses regarding the value of the written procedures, 16 (94%) were positive. 31 responses were received concerning the effect of the procedures on their library's use of the network. 39% felt usage was benefited, while 32% saw no change.

D. Of six suggestions for improvement, three noted the need for improved delivery of materials.

II. SUPER-8MM FILM CIRCUIT:

The responses to most of the questions in this section are fairly straight-forward and need no commentary. However, the answers to II.A.4. should be pointed out: 38% would continue with the circuit if they had to pay extra, 23% said they would not, and 38% were not sure. If the 23% negative can be applied against the total 42 libraries and branches presently on the circuit, it means we could trim the number by about 10 libraries if a direct fee were instituted. If half the undecideds decided no, up to an additional 8 libraries might drop off. The circuit would then be pared down from 42 to somewhere around 24 libraries. This number is comparable to the 27 libraries who circulated an average of at least 20 films per month in 1976.

III. LIBRARY GRANTS PROGRAM:

Answers to questions in this section were scattered or limited to one or two words as the summary indicates. Of most interest are the responses to III.C. Of 25 responses to the question whether or not the library would remain a NORWELD member if grants were eliminated, 56% said yes, 16% said no, and 28% were undecided.

IV. STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM:
Responses in this section indicate that the NORWELD sessions do have some impact on the local library, although perhaps not as great or as immediate as might be hoped. The summaries are self-explanatory.

V. PUBLIC RELATIONS PROGRAM:
Nothing much can be pointed out concerning the responses in this section except to note that of 25 answers in V.B., 40% felt bookmarks and posters make no significant contribution, 32% felt they did, and 28% did not know.

VI. ADMINISTRATION:
As mentioned above, no summary of responses is given for this section. What comments were made in VI.A. were very positive.

VII. NORWELD IN GENERAL

A. On the following page are two tables which detail the responses received concerning the rankings asked for in this section. Table 1 lists the ten aspects of NORWELD in order according to number of first place votes received. Where two or more had the same number of first place votes, second place votes determined the ranking, and so on. The circles indicate which of the ten received the most votes in each rank. "Administration" was the only category which did not receive the most votes in any rank.

Table 2 provides various means of comparing the program aspects. The ten are listed in order according to their mean rank; those with the same mean rank were listed by median rank, and then by first place votes, if necessary. The only change in the order listed between tables 1 and 2 was that "Administration" moved from third to fourth place, while "Media Grants" moved from fourth to third.

While many conclusions can be drawn under analysis from the available data, this writer has done nothing more than attempt to group the ten into five categories of importance, based on a subjective weighing of all the comparative data listed. The groupings can be seen in Table 2 as horizontal lines encompassing certain of the ten programs. The groupings are meant to indicate that, taking all factors into consideration, the programs between any two lines were regarded as just about equal in importance over the course of all the votes cast.

B. Of 20 answers directly responding to the question of providing additional local funds for NORWELD, 50% felt more could be given, 35% were not sure, and 15% definitely said they could not. Only three persons could think of alternative funding sources.

Section VII A - LIBRARY QUESTIONNAIRE

Table 1

Distribution - Ranking By Most 1st Place Votes

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th
Reference Network	(10)	8	3	2	1	0	1	0	0	1
Interlibrary Loan	9	(9)	4	2	0	0	0	1	0	1
Administration	5	2	3	1	3	3	3	3	2	1
Media Grants	1	4	(6)	(6)	5	0	3	1	0	0
Book Grants	1	3	2	3	(6)	2	1	5	1	2
16mm Collection	0	0	3	(6)	3	(7)	4	1	2	0
16mm Features	0	0	2	1	4	6	(6)	1	1	5
S-8mm Circuit	0	0	2	1	3	4	(6)	1	3	6
Staff Development	0	0	1	3	1	3	2	(7)	8	1
Public Relations	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	6	(9)	(9)

Table 2

Comparisons - Ranking By Mean and Median

	Mean Rank	Median Rank	1st place votes	# top 3 votes	# top 5 votes	10th place votes	# bottom 3 votes
Ref. Net.	2.5	2	10	21	24	1	1
I.L.L.	2.5	2	9	22	24	1	2
Med. Grants	4.0	4	1	11	22	0	1
Admin.	4.9	5	5	10	14	1	6
Bk. Grants	5.5	5	1	6	15	2	8
16mm Coll.	5.5	6	0	3	12	0	3
16mm Fea.	6.7	6.5	0	2	7	5	7
S-8 Circ.	7.2	7	0	2	6	6	10
Staff Dev.	7.3	8	0	1	5	1	16
P.R.	8.8	9	0	0	1	9	24

C. In contrast to the uncertainties expressed above in VII.B., the overall impression of NORWELD was overwhelmingly favorable. The biggest problem envisioned was delivery of materials and the need for a delivery system.

D. Of 20 suggestions received in this section, 40% noted that NORWELD should slowdown, level off, and/or maintain existing services without expanding. This response should be taken into account as NORWELD plans future programs and services.

NORWELD - 1976

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MEMBER LIBRARIES
(please complete and return to the NORWELD office no later than December 22, 1976).

LIBRARY: TOTALS sent out 50 returned 29

I. REFERENCE & INTERLIBRARY LOAN NETWORK:

A. What is your impression of the network in 1976? Has service improved, diminished, or stayed the same; for what reasons?

positive-19
negative- 0

problems with postal service-5

improved service-12
quicker service-3
same service-6
diminished service-2

B. Has your library's use of the network changed--quantitatively and qualitatively--in 1976, as opposed to 1975? For what reasons?

YES-19 I.L.L: increased use-15; decrease-3; same-4
NO- 7 Ref: increased use-14; decrease-3; same-4

Better local resources consulted before using network-5
# of questions has dropped while complexity has increased-1
More specific questions with better understanding of the network-1

C. Did the implementation of written procedures and guidelines affect your use of the network? What is your impression of the value--or lack of value--of these written policies?

Guidelines were necessary/valuable/helpful/etc. (positive responses)-16
Guidelines made use of network better/more uniform/easier/-12
Library tries to follow guidelines-7
Guidelines did not affect network use-10
Guidelines hard to use-2
Guidelines had no value-1

D. Other comments and/or suggestions for improvement in 1977:

Need delivery system-3
Need notification of a request's status-2
Need clearer reports on requests (TWX hard to decipher)-1
Need workshop on reference materials for small libraries-1

II. SUPER-8MM FILM CIRCUIT:

A. Is your library part of the circuit in 1976? 26 YES/ 3 NO

B. If YES:

1. Are 30 films per group 26 enough/ 0 too few/ 0 too many?

2. Do the kinds of films included meet the needs of your patrons? 16 YES/ 9 NO -- if NO, what kinds are needed? more sound-5; more cartoons-4; too many cartoons-1; children's-3; sports/travel-3; adult/documentary-2; old movies, more variety, holiday.

3. Any further comments or suggestions for improvement in 1977:

Keep films 2 months-1
One catalog enough-1
Prompt/excellent coop.-1
delivery always late-1

4. If you had to pay an extra fee ($50-$100) to remain in the circuit, would you stay in? Please explain.

YES-10
NO-6
maybe/don't know-10

C. If NO in IIA above, why did you not join the circuit in 1976? Do you wish to do so in 1977?

Not used enough-1
No requests-1

III. LIBRARY GRANTS PROGRAM:

A. $75 Book Grant - What books did you purchase that you had never acquired before? Did you find them to be helpful in serving your patrons? In what way?

Helpful-17
Not helpful-1

B. $1300 Media Grant - What materials and equipment did you purchase? What items were things your library had never owned before? How did your patrons respond to these new items? Was it worthwhile to acquire these items for your library?

YES-23
NO-0

C. Grants in General - What are your overall feelings concerning the grants? Have they given you an opportunity to test new library service ideas for your area? If the grants were eliminated and your membership in NORWELD were to cost the same as it does now (or increase by about 10%), would you remain a member? How necessary are grants to the project's success from your point of view? Please explain.

Positive-23
Negative-0

Stay without grants? YES-14
NO-4
don't know/depends-7

IV. STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM: For each session listed below, please indicate how many persons attended from your library, the overall reaction to the session, and what specific actions have been taken at your library to implement the ideas presented.

1. Puppetry Workshop, Rossford, April 2 - 13 attended.
   nothing new-1; puppet shows added-5
   effective-4; interesting-1

2. Book Discussion Meeting, Rossford, April 7 - 11 attended.
   purchased books discussed-5
   informative-4

3. Reference Network & Policies Meeting, Toledo, May 7 - 15 attended.
   made network use more efficient/improved use-7
   no value-1; helpful-4

4. Outreach Workshop, Huron, October 7 - 10 attended.
   positive-2
   nothing new-2
   interest in large print circuit-2

5. Outreach Workshop, Delta, October 13 - 13 attended.
   good-7
   interest in large print circuit-1
   more nursing home service-1

6. Book Discussion Meeting, Port Clinton, November 5 - 12 attended.
   ordered books discussed-6
   enjoyable-3
   should have book theme-2

What suggestions do you have for future staff development?

2 mentions each: discussion group on funding; and in budgetmaking; reference workshop every year; legal limitations-e.g. unruly patrons; handling parents of children misusing library or losing books.

1 mention each: library financing for supportive staff; young adults; public relations; overdues; weeding; book selection aids; developing small library collections; preschool story hours (new ideas).

V. PUBLIC RELATIONS PROGRAM:

A. Did you take advantage of the slide/tape program in 1976? How many slides (estimate) were produced from project funds? In what specific ways did this program help your library? (If you did not use this program, why not?)

YES-5 920 slides
NO-20

B. Please comment on the bookmarks and posters distributed so far this year. In your view, does the provision of such materials contribute significantly to increased library usage by making previously uninformed patrons aware of our service? Please explain.

no significant contribution-10
significant-8
don't know-7

enjoyed-5 eye-catching/attractive-13

C. Please comment on the NORWELDer. Is it useful to you? How could it be improved? Useful-25

enjoy-6
always read-5
love it-1
add bestseller list-1
select committee to help put it together-1

D. Please evaluate the usefulness of the Directory of Member Libraries from your point of view. What additional information should be included? What items eliminated?(please base your answers on the 1975 edition):

useful-10
use constantly-4
good tool-9
don't use much-6
include names of clerks & board presidents.
list all library personnel by name & title.
include info on trustees.

E. Any general comments on the P.R. Program?

P.R. mainly province of local library-2
could use radio & TV spots-1
very good-1

VI. ADMINISTRATION: A. Comments, criticism, or recommendations for improvement with regard to each item listed below. Please be as specific as possible:

1. Project Director -

2. Operation of the NORWELD office -

3. Administering Library -

4. Advisory and other committees -

5. General Comments -

B. Listed below are the standing committees needed for the 1977 project. Please write in your name or that of staff members after the committees on which you and your staff are most interested in serving next year. (After each committee is noted the total number of members needed)

1. Advisory Committee (10 librarians, 10 trustees) -

2. Reference Sub-committee (6 librarians) -

3. Media Sub-committee (6 librarians) -

4. Goals & Directions Sub-committee (10 librarians) -

VII. NORWELD IN GENERAL:

A. Please rank the following aspects of NORWELD in terms of the importance of their contribution to NORWELD's cooperative goals and to the improvement of library services for patrons in your area. In other words, if we had to limit services, in what order should we cut out the various programs that are listed below? Use a rating of 1 to 10, with 1 as most important and 10 as the first thing to be eliminated:

SEE TABLES ELSEWHERE

Administration_____	Reference Network_____
Book Grants_____	16mm Feature Film Rental_____
Interlibrary Loan Network_____	16mm Film Collection_____
Media Grants_____	Staff Development_____
Public Relations_____	Super-8 Film Circuit_____

B. If federal funding were eliminated or drastically curtailed, what alternative revenue sources do you see for NORWELD? How far would your library be able to go in providing additional funds?

more local funds maybe-9
can't say how far local funds can go-7
can't provide additional-3
could double contribution-1
budget tight-1
county-wide levies-1
direct grants from foundations-2
don't know any alternative

C. What is your overall impression of NORWELD? Was it worthwhile to join in 1976? What do you see as some of its good points and its biggest problems?

worthwhile-22
can't imagine no NORWELD-2
outstanding/great/etc.-7
indispensible-1
absolutely-1

Problems:
Delivery system-5
lack of funding-1
dealing w/bureaucracy-1
might be overextending-2

D. What suggestions do you have for programs and services, goals and directions in 1978, in 5 years, and in 10 years--where do you believe we should be heading?

maintain & improve present service w/out expanding-6
slowdown, level off-2
delivery system-3
coop/joint purchasing-2
large print circuit-3
better media service-1
more work w/trustees-1
NO A.L.S.O.-1
computerization-1

E. Any final comments?

APPENDIX IIIa

NORWELD INTERLIBRARY LOANS
ANNUAL REPORT, 1976

Library	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	TOTAL
Archbold	43	33	51	35	162
Bellevue	79	34	32	41	186
Bloomville	14	6	0	8	28
Bowling Green	108	105	97	95	405
Clyde	203	181	92	86	562
Defiance	148	123	83	119	473
Delta	67	81	108	105	361
Deshler	55	20	11	19	105
Elmore	130	86	69	85	370
Fayette	12	16	30	46	104
Findlay	39	11	25	23	98
Fostoria	74	46	40	39	199
Fremont	67	41	32	48	188
Huron	22	31	40	62	155
Liberty Center	56	23	46	18	143
McComb	32	16	15	21	84
Metamora	35	18	8	9	70
Milan	59	26	21	35	141
North Baltimore	40	39	15	32	126
Norwalk	100	100	69	69	338
Oak Harbor	108	91	108	68	375
Paulding	138	61	78	96	373
Pemberville	193	130	70	104	497
Perrysburg	158	127	140	123	548
Port Clinton	106	55	35	76	272
Rossford	89	56	62	149	356
Sandusky	151	88	69	72	380
Swanton	60	27	21	32	140
Tiffin	62	76	80	54	272
Vermilion	8	1	11	4	24
Wauseon	131	140	131	101	503
Wayne	22	5	1	1	29
Weston	32	18	22	17	89
Willard	60	28	65	47	200
TOTALS	2,701	1,939	1,777	1,939	8,356

APPENDIX IIIb

NORWELD REFERENCE REQUESTS
ANNUAL REPORT, 1976

Library	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	TOTALS
Archbold	10	5	12	7	34
Bellevue	22	6	7	10	45
Bloomville	6	7	2	6	21
Bowling Green	40	36	37	39	152
Clyde	49	33	12	24	118
Defiance	72	35	24	31	162
Delta	21	27	36	35	119
Deshler	14	5	5	8	32
Elmore	36	18	19	13	86
Fayette	4	5	8	5	22
Findlay	35	31	30	19	115
Fostoria	33	17	17	14	81
Fremont	13	2	3	2	20
Huron	9	8	9	11	37
Liberty Center	17	9	18	6	50
McComb	13	9	7	15	44
Metamora	9	3	0	2	14
Milan	28	4	7	7	46
North Baltimore	11	11	6	9	37
Norwalk	23	3	14	15	55
Oak Harbor	37	13	29	19	98
Paulding	27	13	23	30	93
Pemberville	35	24	19	17	95
Perrysburg	43	26	40	33	142
Port Clinton	36	5	10	23	74
Rossford	15	12	17	37	81
Sandusky	50	21	9	10	90
Swanton	16	6	4	1	27
Tiffin	44	27	33	35	139
Vermilion	0	0	0	1	1
Wauseon	40	29	34	30	133
Wayne	7	3	1	2	13
Weston	10	4	6	4	24
Willard	22	6	16	16	60
TOTALS	847	463	514	536	2,360

APPENDIX IIIc

CORE REFERENCE STATISTICS

ANNUAL REPORT, 1976

	CITED MATERIAL	SUBJECT OR SPECIFIC INFORMATION	TOTAL
MAIL	4,912	968	5,880
TELEPHONE	3,049	1,392	4,441
OTHER	48	0	48
TOTAL	8,009	2,360	10,369
NOT ANSWERED	14	107	121
REFERRED	2,679	7	2,686
PARTIALLY ANSWERED	0	48	48
ANSWERED	6,466	2,201	8,667
ILL	5,492	2,864	8,356
TELEPHONE	0	311	311
LETTER	0	142	142
OTHER	73	29	102
PHOTOCOPY	911	469	1,380
NO. PAGES	3,128	2,263	5,391

APPENDIX IVa

NORWELD SUPER-8 CIRCULATION REPORT - ANNUAL REPORT, 1976

East Circuit	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	TOTAL
Oak Harbor	75	36	81	97	289
Port Clinton	110	103	67	98	378
Sandusky	77	58	158	120	413
Huron	128	80	90	49	347
Vermilion	123	52	92	58	325
Berlin Heights	105	18	102	105	330
Milan	120	121	272	131	644
Norwalk	140	54	142	128	464
Bellevue	86	54	49	82	271
Clyde	199	85	144	134	562
Willard	91	21	82	74	268
Tiffin	80	27	135	91	333
Green Springs	9	2	0	18	29
Fremont	67	25	31	62	185
Woodville	76	20	31	32	159
Elmore	4	10	59	20	93
Genoa	68	40	57	89	254
Wakeman	0	0	56	40	96
Greenwich	0	0	10	0	10
Castalia	0	0	38	37	75
West Circuit					
Deshler	73	24	40	39	176
Liberty Center	14	24	24	77	139
Defiance	185	51	139	127	502
Hicksville	84	13	59	45	201
Fayette	13	0			13
Archbold	47	5	15	21	88
Wauseon	67	77	55	87	286
Delta	27	45	35	70	177
Swanton	257	82	81	74	494
Metamora	6	0	21	23	50
Rossford	47	10	132	53	242
Perrysburg	120	33	115	112	380
Stony Ridge	64	26	62	82	234
Paulding	119	32	94	82	327
Pemberville	77	16	58	98	249
Bowling Green	128	48	136	85	397
North Baltimore	135	37	104	85	361
Findlay	106	59	59	70	294
McComb	115	86	113	137	451
Maumee Branch	0	0	81	108	189
Great Eastern	0	0	96	111	207
Malinta	0	0	41	41	82
Hamler	0	0	75	81	156
TOTALS	3,242	1,474	3,331	3,173	11,220

APPENDIX IVb

1976 NORWELD MEDIA GRANTS
Materials and Equipment Purchased

Library	Records	Cassettes 8-tracks	Filmstrips	Other Materials & Equipment
Archbold-McLaughlin				16mm projector; slide projector; screen; A/V storage; 16mm film.
Bellevue	71	3	14	16mm projector; screen; A/V storage.
Bloomville-Bliss	31			microfilm reader/printer
Bowling Green-Wood	95			16mm projector; 16mm films-(2)
Clyde	77	21	9	filmstrip projector; A/V storage.
Defiance	48			16mm projector; record players; supplies.
Delta	40	41		16mm projector; A/V storage
Deshler-Pat. Henry	10	16	56	16mm projector.
Elmore-Harris				16mm projector; microfilm reader; 26 rolls microfilm.
Fayette-Normal	179			A/V storage; framed art.
Findlay-Hancock	113		5	A/V storage.
Fostoria-Kaubisch		65		microfilm readers (3).
Fremont-Birchard	82			8mm projectors (3); slide projector; cassette player & recorder.
Huron	98	17		A/V storage.
Liberty Center	35	70	10	8mm projector; filmstrip projector; cassette recorders (3); posters (34).
McComb		15	14	8mm projector; filmstrip projector; cassette recorders (2).
Metamora		30	1 set	16mm projector; microfilm reader; record player.

Library	Records	Cassettes 8-tracks	Filmstrips	Other Materials and Equipment
Milan				8mm projector; filmstrip projectors (2); framed art.
North Baltimore			1 set	16mm projector; A/V storage; art prints (10).
Norwalk	11			framed art; storage.
Oak Harbor	22			16mm projector; 8mm projector; screen; record player.
Paulding				microfilm.
Pemberville	68			16mm films (2); music scores (2).
Perrysburg-Way				16mm projector; 8mm projector; microfiche & reader; play corral.
Port Clinton-Ida Rupp	107	21		8mm projector; screen.
Rossford	153	8	9	filmstrip viewer; posters (53)
Sandusky				microfilm reader.
Swanton	114	7		slide projector; screen; cassette recorder; art prints (6); other.
Tiffin	54	39	39	cassette player.
Vermilion	11	44	69	
Wauseon	70			A/V storage.
Wayne				copying machine.
Weston	74		17	screen.
Willard				copying machine.
TOTALS	1563	397	244	Projectors: 16mm-11; 8mm- 9; filmstrip- 6; slide- 3. Screens-6; A/V storage-8; Microfilm/fiche readers-8; Record/cassette players-12; Copiers-2.